

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claim 10 has been amended. Claims 18-23 are new. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,455,629 issued to Sun, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's contention that Sun is an anticipating reference.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that Sun is not in the same field as the claimed invention. Sun is directed to a decoding unit for a single MPEG sequence. In Sun, this single sequence is split into two parts for transmission – a high-priority part and a low-priority part. See Sun at column 1, lines 30-43; column 5, lines 52-55. This is done to reduce transmission errors. Sun then describes how to recover the single sequence when decoding and how to regenerate a coherent sequence when low-priority elements are lost during transmission. In Sun, high and low priority refer to the importance of the data to reconstructing a single sequence. Further, the decoder of Sun does not prioritize high and low priority data – the prioritizing is done by the transmitter of Sun, not the decoder. In contrast, the present invention is directed to a system and method for decoding a plurality of MPEG sequences simultaneously.

Turning to the language of the claims, claim 10 recites: “A method for decoding a plurality of MPEG sequences simultaneously using a single MPEG decoder, comprising: receiving first and second image sequences of coded images; receiving a stream of decoding commands, each decoding command corresponding to a respective one of the coded images; prioritizing the received coded images.” As noted above, Sun does not simultaneously decode a plurality of MPEG sequences. The Examiner points to the error token generator 65 of Figure 8 of Sun as receiving coded images. The error token generator 65 provides substitute data for missing low priority blocks of a single image sequence. Even assuming error token generator 65 receives an image sequence, there is no mention in the description of Figure 8 of the error token generator 65 of Figure 8 “receiving first and second image sequences of coded images” as recited.

Sun also does not prioritize the received coded images. The Examiner contends that elements 60, 61 and 65 “receive the priority data of the coded image data.” Even if true, this

is not the same thing as “prioritizing the received coded images”, as recited. Claim 17 depends from claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10 and 17 are not anticipated by Sun.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sun in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,786 issued to Oku, et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s contention that Sun in view of Oku renders claims 1-9 and 11-16 obvious.

Independent claim 1 recites: “a decoder control circuit for controlling an MPEG decoder, structured to decode several coded images in a plurality of periods ... including a priority assignment circuit structured to, at each period, grant among the images a decoding priority to any of the images of the first type that still have not been decoded one period after their decoding order.” Similarly, independent claim 8 recites: “receiving first and second image sequences of coded images, each coded image having an image type that is one of a plurality of image types; receiving a stream of decoding commands in a series of synchronizing periods, each decoding command corresponding to a respective one of the coded images; ... prioritizing the decoding commands by assigning to each decoding command a priority level based on the image type of the coded image corresponding to the decoding command; decoding the coded images in a priority order based on the priorities assigned to the coded images, thereby producing first and second images sequences of decoded images; and displaying the first and second image sequences.”

The Examiner identifies intraframe coding frames (I frames) and two types of interframe predictive coding frames (P and B frames) as the claimed image types and then points to column 8, lines 19-26, to assert that priority is assigned on the basis of an image type. “Type”, however, at column 8, lines 19-26 of Sun, refers to an expected codeword type, not to an image type, and the cited section discusses passing either the HP or the LP signal of an image sequence. Thus, Sun is not an appropriate primary reference because it does not teach or suggest a “priority assignment circuit structured to, at each period, grant among the images a decoding priority to any of the images of the first type,” as recited in claim 1 or “prioritizing the decoding

commands by assigning to each decoding command a priority level based on the image type of the coded image corresponding to the decoding command,” as recited in claim 8.

In addition, the Examiner concedes that Sun does not teach the use of periods in a prioritizing scheme. The Examiner contends this is taught by Oku, citing to column 3, lines 25-48. The cited portion of Oku does not discuss synchronization periods. Moreover, Oku does not teach, suggest or motivate assigning decoding priority levels to image sequences during a synchronization period, let alone priority assignments based on an image type.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and claim 9 depends from claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 are not rendered obvious by Sun in view of Oku.

Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10. As discussed above, Sun does not teach or suggest simultaneously decoding a plurality of MPEG sequences using a single decoder, as recited in claim 10. The Examiner does not contend that this is taught or suggested by Oku. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-16 are not rendered obvious by Sun in view of Oku.


New claims 18-23 have been added to claim additional embodiments disclosed in the specification. See, Figures 3-7 and the accompanying descriptions thereof. New claim 18 recites “an MPEG decoder configured to decode a plurality of MPEG image sequences in parallel.” New claims 19-23 depend from claim 18. As noted above, neither Sun nor Oku teach or suggest an MPEG decoder configured to decode a plurality of MPEG image sequences in parallel. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claims 18-23 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Sun alone or in combination with Oku.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Application No. 09/770,112  
Reply to Office Action dated September 9, 2004

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.  
Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy L. Boller  
Registration No. 47,435

TLB:rg

Enclosure:  
Postcard

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300  
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

557448\_1.DOC